

REMARKS

The applicants have carefully considered the official action mailed on April 5, 2007, and the reference cited therein. In the official action, claims 1, 3-9, 11-18, 20-25, and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Krishnaswamy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,051,367), and claims 2, 10, 19, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Krishnaswamy et al. in view of Lipe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,980). Claims 1-30 remain pending in this application, of which claims 1, 9, 17, and 24 are independent. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Independent claim 1 is directed to a method to provide a platform-level network security framework that, *inter alia*, identifies one or more platform-level network security protocols associated with an extensible firmware interface (EFI). None of the cited references describes or suggests identifying one or more platform-level network security protocols associated with an EFI, as recited in claim 1.

The examiner contends that Krishnaswamy et al. describe identifying one or more platform-level network security protocols associated with an EFI (*see page 2 of the official action*). While Krishnaswamy et al. employ various network protocols to route network traffic, and employ counters to determine whether protocol-specific thresholds are exceeded, Krishnaswamy et al. are completely devoid of a network security protocol, much less one or more platform-level network security protocols associated with an EFI. [Krishnaswamy et al., 2:17-28]. Unlike an EFI, Krishnaswamy et al. describe using a finely controlled software process executing

within a multithreaded operating environment (instead of using software interrupts) when a network attack is detected. [Id., 1:57-60, 3:59 through 4:2].

Rather than describe or suggest any isolation of the operating system, much less an EFI, Krishnaswamy et al. further describe that an operating system plays an integral role in processing packets in which the operating system, such as UNIX, provides the multi tasking environment for kernel processes and user processes. [Id., 4:14-24]. Such close integration of the operating system with packet processing, rather than an EFI, is shown in FIG. 2 of Krishnaswamy et al., in which the operating system executes user processes, kernel processes, and invokes packet service routines (PSR's). [Id., FIG. 2, 4:39-58].

The examiner also contends that Krishnaswamy et al. describe identifying the packet with a network security condition based on the one or more platform-level network security protocols (*see page 2 of the official action*). However, while Krishnaswamy et al. describe analysis of network conditions (but is silent to network security conditions), such analysis includes the PSR monitoring protocol-specific thresholds. [Id., 6:9-13]. Again, because the PSR is invoked/executed by the operating system, Krishnaswamy et al. fail to describe or suggest platform-level network protocols, much less identifying the packet with a network security condition based on the one or more platform-level network security protocols, as recited in claim 1. [Id., 6:4-20]. Moreover, Krishnaswamy et al. reemphasize that, unlike an EFI, the PSR's monitor such traffic levels for inbound packets, in which such PSR's are invoked by the operating system, or a kernel process of the operating system. [Id., 5:7-13, 6:20-22].

Accordingly, the applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over the art of record, and that the rejection of claim 1, and claims 2-8 dependent thereon, must be withdrawn.

Independent claims 9, 17, and 24 are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1. Thus, the applicants respectfully submit that these claims and all claims dependent thereon are also in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues in this application, the applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency in the enclosed check toward payment of any fee due for the filing of this paper to deposit account number 50-2455.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark G. Hanley/
Mark G. Hanley
Reg. No. 44,736
Attorney for Applicant(s)
150 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 2100
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 580-1020

June 27, 2007